

I thank the gentlelady from Michigan and her staff for working with me on this bill and for bringing it to the floor today.

As part of the 2004 Border Strategy, the Border Patrol has been reporting miles of the border under operational or effective control and included it in its annual performance reporting.

However, as of fiscal year 2010, the metric has no longer been reported, with the Department instead relying on reporting apprehensions which tell only a part of what's happening at the border and planning for the yet to be rolled out "Border Condition Index."

In fact, the Department's recently released 2012–2016 Border Strategy makes no reference to operational control or any other readily reportable metrics to evaluate border security.

Far be it from me to ascribe a motive to the situation the Administration has created regarding the border security metrics they are or are not employing, but it certainly looks like they would simply prefer to ignore data that doesn't support their "border is safer than ever" narrative.

Sadly, for those living in border communities, there is some daylight between that narrative and reality and for that reason I urged the Department to resume using operational control during this year's appropriations process.

In speaking with Arizonans making their living on the border, I continue to hear story after story of break-ins, run-ins with armed groups crossing the border, and other dangerous situations.

In recent days much has been made about apparent momentum that is building towards Congress finding solutions to the problems created by our broken immigration system.

I have said it before and I'll say it again: there is little hope of the American public—particularly in border communities—trusting the Federal Government to deal with the many pressing immigration issues if we cannot get it right when it comes to border security.

There is simply no tackling immigration reform without achieving operational control of our southern border, and the Federal Government can't achieve operational control if they can't define it.

This legislation is simple; it would direct the Department to resume reporting operational control exactly as they had been previously.

If Congress and the Administration are in indeed serious about getting about the business of addressing the issue of border security, the successful passage of this common-sense and noncontroversial bill is the least we can do.

I urge adoption of H.R. 6025.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6025, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5913) to create an independent advisory panel to comprehensively assess the management structure and capabilities related to the Department of Homeland Security and make recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of the Department, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5913

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS Accountability Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that the Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management of the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives held a series of four hearings related to the management of the Department of Homeland Security. The key findings from such hearings were the following:

(1) The Department of Homeland Security has not prioritized the missions outlined in its key strategic planning documents. This lack of prioritization may hinder the Department's efforts to effectively manage risks to the United States. Since 2003, the Government Accountability Office designated the transformation of the Department as high risk because the Department had to transform 22 agencies—several with major management challenges—into one department, and failure to effectively address the Department's management and mission risks could have serious consequences to United States national and economic security. The Government Accountability Office continues to designate the transformation of the Department as high risk.

(2) The Department has considerable work ahead to achieve actions and outcomes critical to addressing persistent management challenges. For example, a significant number of acquisition programs proceeded without component or departmental approval of essential planning documents. These reviews are important to ensure the success of an acquisition program. The Department also continues to face challenges implementing key human capital initiatives. Integrating financial data essential to effectively managing the Department also remains a challenge.

(3) Areas of duplicative effort have also been identified within the Department. For example, some Federal Government agencies are paying fees to the Department's Federal Protective Service for facility risk assessments that are not being performed, while at the same time performing their own risk assessments. The Department also lacks robust acquisition practices in place to position programs for success. Federal Government auditors questioned U.S. Customs and Border Protection's plan to secure the Arizona border because the agency could not justify the specific types, quantities, cost, and deployment locations of its surveillance technologies.

(4) Investigators continue to identify cases of employee corruption within the Department. Investigations by the Department's Inspector General led to over 400 arrests of employees in 2011. Examples include Border Patrol agents accepting bribes, thefts by airport screeners, and immigration officers complicit in fraud. In addition, overall employee morale in the Department remains one of the lowest in the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established in the legislative branch an independent advisory panel to—

(1) comprehensively assess the management structure and capabilities related to the Department of Homeland Security; and

(2) make recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of the Department.

SEC. 4. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The independent advisory panel (in this Act referred to as the "Panel") established under section 3 shall be composed of eight members as follows:

(1) Two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives. Only one of such members may be from the same political party as the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) Two members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in coordination with the Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate. Only one of such members may be from the same political party as the majority leader of the Senate.

(3) One member shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, in coordination with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(4) One member shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, in coordination with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(5) Two members shall be appointed by the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security. Only one of such members may be from the same political party as the President.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (a), members of the Panel may not be current appointees of the President's Administration or Members of Congress, in order to ensure objectivity of the Panel's assessments.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENTS.—All appointments to the Panel shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CO-CHAIRMEN.—The Panel shall have two co-chairmen, as follows:

(1) A co-chairman who shall be a member of the Panel designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) A co-chairman who shall be a member of the Panel designated by the majority leader of the Senate.

(e) VACANCY.—In the event of a vacancy on the Panel, the individual appointed to fill the vacant seat shall be—

(1) subject to paragraph (2), appointed by the same officer (or the officer's successor) who made the appointment to the seat when the Panel was first established; or

(2) if the officer's successor is of a party other than the party of the officer who made the initial appointment when the Panel was first established, chosen in consultation with the senior officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the party which is the party of the officer who made such initial appointment.

(f) GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Members of the Panel who are officers or employees of the Federal Government shall serve without additional pay (or benefits in the nature of compensation) for service as a member of the Panel.

(g) INITIAL MEETING.—The Panel shall meet and begin the operations of the Panel not later than 60 days after the appointment of all Panel members under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall assess the current management structure and capabilities of the Department of Homeland Security, including examining the following:

(1) The efficiency and effectiveness of the management structure and capabilities, including the policies, practices, and procedures, of the Department of Homeland Security and its component agencies in carrying out the management functions, such as program acquisition, financial management, information technology, human capital issues, performance measurement, and risk management efforts, related to homeland security.

(2) The extent to which unnecessary duplication exists in such management structure and capabilities, and how, if at all, such duplication negatively affects the mission of protecting the United States.

(3) The extent to which management of key homeland security missions is centralized under the Department.

(4) Options, as appropriate, to reduce or eliminate harmful waste and duplication of effort in the Department.

(5) Measures to evaluate the Department's progress in reducing and eliminating waste and duplication from its management structure and capabilities.

(b) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out its duties, the Panel should consult and leverage the work performed and recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office on the management structure and capabilities of the Department of Homeland Security, in particular with respect to the issues identified under subsection (a).

SEC. 6. POWERS AND AUTHORITIES.

(a) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Panel or, on the authority of the Panel, any portion thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this section—

(A) hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths (provided that the quorum for a hearing shall be two members of the Panel); and

(B) subject to subsection (b), require by subpoena or otherwise provide for the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Panel, or such portion thereof, may determine advisable.

(2) **OPEN TO THE PUBLIC.**—Hearings and other activities conducted under paragraph (1) shall be open to the public unless the Panel, or, on the authority of the Panel, any portion thereof, determines that such is not appropriate, including for reasons relating to the disclosure of information or material regarding the national security interests of the United States or the disclosure of sensitive law enforcement data.

(b) SUBPOENAS.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A subpoena may be issued under this subsection only—

(i) by the two co-chairmen; or

(ii) by the affirmative recorded vote of six members of the Panel.

(B) **SIGNATURE.**—Subpoenas issued under this subsection may be—

(i) issued under the signature of the two co-chairmen or any member designated by a majority of the Panel; and

(ii) served by any person designated by the two co-chairmen or by any member designated by a majority of the Panel.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under this subsection, the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found, or where the subpoena is returnable, may issue an order requiring such person to produce documentary or other evidence. Any failure to obey the order of the

court may be punished by the court as contempt of that court.

(B) **ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT.**—In the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena, the Panel may, by majority vote, certify a statement of fact constituting such failure to the appropriate United States attorney, who may bring the matter before a grand jury for its action, under the same statutory authority and procedures as if the United States attorney had received a certification under sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192 through 194).

(c) PERSONNEL.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Panel shall have the authorities provided in section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, and shall be subject to the conditions specified in such section, except to the extent that such conditions would be inconsistent with the requirements of this section.

(2) **COMPENSATION.**—The co-chairmen, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Panel, may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Panel to carry out its functions, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this paragraph may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) **DETAILEES.**—Any employee of the Federal Government may be detailed to the Panel without reimbursement from the Panel, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of the employee's regular employment without interruption.

(4) **EXPERT AND CONSULTANT SERVICES.**—The Panel is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) **VOLUNTEER SERVICES.**—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Panel may accept and use voluntary and uncompensated services as the Panel determines necessary.

(d) **SECURITY CLEARANCES.**—The appropriate departments or agencies of the Federal Government shall cooperate with the Panel in expeditiously providing to the Panel members and staff appropriate security clearances to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements, except that no person shall be provided with access to classified information under this section without the appropriate security clearances.

(e) **CONTRACTING.**—The Panel may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Panel to carry out its duties under this Act.

(f) **POSTAL SERVICES.**—The Panel may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

(g) **SUPPORT SERVICES.**—Upon request of the Panel, the Administrator of General Services shall provide the Panel, on a reimbursable basis, with the administrative support services necessary for the Panel to carry out its duties under this Act. Such administrative services may include human resource management, budget, leasing, accounting, and payroll services.

(h) **RULES OF PROCEDURE.**—The Panel may establish rules for the conduct of the Panel's business, if such rules are not inconsistent with this Act or other applicable law.

(i) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Panel.

(j) **TERMINATION.**—The Panel shall terminate on the date that is 60 days after the date of the submission of its final report.

SEC. 7. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) **INTERIM REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the appointment of all the members of the Panel, the Panel shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an interim report, including the results and findings of the assessment and examination carried out in accordance with section 5.

(b) **OTHER REPORTS AND BRIEFINGS.**—The Panel may from time to time submit to the committees specified in subsection (a) such other reports and briefings relating to the assessment and examination carried out in accordance with section 5 as the Panel considers appropriate. Such committees may request information on the Panel's progress as it conducts its work.

(c) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date of the appointment of all the members of the Panel, the Panel shall submit to the committees specified in subsection (a) a final report on the assessment and examination carried out in accordance with section 5. Such final report shall—

(1) include the findings of the Panel;

(2) identify lessons learned related to homeland security management issues; and

(3) include specific recommendations related to—

(A) improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the management structure and capabilities, including the policies, practices, and procedures, of the Department of Homeland Security and its component agencies in carrying out the Department's management functions and mission to protect the United States;

(B) reducing or eliminating unnecessary duplication in the management structure and capabilities of the Department and its component agencies;

(C) options, as appropriate, to reduce or eliminate harmful waste and duplication of effort in the Department; and

(D) developing measures to evaluate the Department's progress in reducing and eliminating waste and duplication from its management structure and capabilities.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the DHS Accountability Act of 2012.

Congress has an important opportunity to make the Department of Homeland Security a more effective and efficient organization. The purpose of this bipartisan legislation is to create an independent advisory panel to conduct a top-to-bottom examination of deficiencies in the Department's management structure and capabilities. It follows six subcommittee oversight hearings examining corruption, low morale, inefficiency, and waste of taxpayer dollars, and comes almost 10 years since the inception of DHS.

I appreciate the strong support of the ranking member of the Homeland Security Oversight Subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), as an original cosponsor of this bill.

As the third largest Federal Department, DHS has more than 240,000 employees and an annual budget of \$60 billion. It's transformation, according to the GAO, is critical to achieving its Homeland Security mission; however, excessive bureaucracy, waste, ineffectiveness, and lack of transparency have hindered its operations and wasted taxpayer dollars. Mismanagement at the Department is a threat to the security of our homeland.

Since 2003, GAO has designated the transformation of DHS as high risk because the Department had to transform 22 agencies, several with major management challenges, into one Department. Failure to effectively address the Department's management risks could have serious consequences. DHS remains on GAO's high-risk list. While GAO has conducted numerous audits of specific DHS programs, a comprehensive management assessment of the Department has yet to be conducted.

Our hearings and GAO findings conclude that DHS has made some progress but is still dysfunctional in several areas. The Department continues to face challenges in acquisition management, human capital, integration of financial data, and IT. In August, my subcommittee released a report outlining how the Department's management failures, related to a variety of acquisition programs, have wasted taxpayer dollars and had a serious impact on our ability to protect the homeland. The report's findings show why such a panel is needed to help fix the Department's shortcomings.

GAO's recent work also identified areas of duplicative effort. For instance, GAO found agencies are paying for risk assessments that are not being completed while simultaneously conducting their own assessments. Employee morale also remains one of the lowest in the Federal Government. Additionally, there are examples of Border Patrol agents accepting bribes, theft by airport screeners, and immigration officers complicit in fraud. These deficiencies cannot continue.

Based on the findings of these hearings and GAO reviews, I have doubts that the Department can carry out its

core mission of protecting the homeland if the problems persist. These issues of corruption, waste, duplication, and abuse of power are all symptomatic of deeply rooted flaws in the Department's management. I believe it will take a dedicated team of independent investigators to identify the root causes and recommend concrete changes. A top-to-bottom management review is necessary because the current management team is not getting the job done.

The DHS Accountability Act of 2012, as amended, will create an independent eight-member advisory panel appointed by the legislative and executive branches to comprehensively assess DHS management structure and capabilities. It will require the panel to make recommendations to improve DHS's efficiency and effectiveness, and it will require an interim report sent to Congress 1 year after the panel's selection, with the final report due 2 years after its inception.

The panel will possess subpoena power, the authority to conduct hearings, and receive expert witness testimony. The panel's recommendations will help make DHS a leaner, smarter, and more effective organization and ferret out duplicative programs and offices.

Fellow Members, this legislation is our opportunity to take action, and I urge you to support the DHS Accountability Act of 2012.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5913, the DHS Accountability Act of 2012.

The bill before the House today would create an independent advisory panel to comprehensively assess and make recommendations regarding the management structure and capabilities of the Department of Homeland Security. While there is some question about whether this legislation is necessary, as similar independent initiatives are already underway, I appreciate the effort to improve the effectiveness of DHS's management and will not oppose the bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and as I have no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Ranking Member THOMPSON, for yielding your time and for your leadership on the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5913, the Department of Homeland Security Accountability Act of 2012.

As the ranking member for the Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigation, and Management, I was pleased to work with Chairman MCCAUL and serve as the original cosponsor of this measure.

I appreciate the bipartisan discussions that led to the introduction of the amended version we adopted at the subcommittee level, which is the version being considered today.

□ 1650

This bill goes to the heart of the subcommittee's mandate, which is to ensure the effective management of the Department of Homeland Security. Ensuring the effectiveness of the Department of Homeland Security is not a partisan matter, and it should serve as a priority as it is essential to our security and safety in this country.

Since its inception, the Department of Homeland Security has faced significant management challenges, many of which stem from the very nature of its creation, which was transforming 22 legacy agencies into one cohesive, unified department. To its credit, the Department has come a long way since its inception, but more work remains to be done.

The consideration of this bill comes at a time when Congress is examining cost-saving and revenue-generating measures to reduce our deficit while ensuring the safety and well-being of our citizens. There is no doubt that the Department is making positive strides and has clear plans in place to reduce duplicative efforts in the management area. For example, the Department's Efficiency Review Initiative, which was highlighted by Vice President BIDEN as a model for all Federal agencies, has resulted in more than \$1 billion in DHS cost avoidances, including \$180 million saved by consolidating duplicative software licensing agreements.

I am also pleased that the Secretary has advanced internal measures aimed at eliminating waste and fraud. Unfortunately, this does not change the fact that a number of DHS activities are still shared by other Federal agencies.

In March of 2011 and in February of 2012, the GAO identified six areas across DHS where overlap or potential unnecessary duplication exists. For example, when it comes to personnel background investigations, cybersecurity trainings, and the identification of fraudulent travel documents, the lines between multiple agencies remain blurred. Furthermore, despite its management strides, the Department has yet to fully address deficiencies in component operations that result in the wasting of funds. The Department's Federal Protective Service has received over \$230 million from Federal agencies for risk assessments and security services, yet these agencies have not found the FPS's services adequate or satisfactory, so they perform their own assessments as well.

This bill will determine instances of waste and abuse through an independent advisory panel that will be

charged with two main responsibilities: to comprehensively assess the management structure and capabilities related to the Department and to make recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of the Department. The legislation instructs the panel to examine five broad categories:

the efficiency and effectiveness of management structure and capabilities; whether unnecessary duplication exists; the extent to which management of key homeland security missions is centralized; waste and duplication.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan effort will comprise this panel's work through the course of this session, which has been extensive. I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL for his efforts in dealing with these issues. I want to thank him for the bipartisan cooperation that has been there on important issues of national security. I also want to thank the ranking member for yielding his time and for his leadership on the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this legislation, and I look forward to its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5913, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAIME ZAPATA BORDER ENFORCEMENT SECURITY TASK FORCE ACT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 915) to establish a Border Enforcement Security Task Force program to enhance border security by fostering coordinated efforts among Federal, State, and local border and law enforcement officials to protect United States border cities and communities from transnational crime, including violence associated with drug trafficking, arms smuggling, illegal alien trafficking and smuggling, violence, and kidnapping along and across the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Jaime Zapata Border Enforcement Security Task Force Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSES.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) overriding mission is to lead a unified national effort to protect the United States. United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is the largest investigative agency within DHS and is charged with enforcing a wide array of laws, including laws related to securing the border and combating criminal smuggling.

(2) Mexico's northern border with the United States has experienced a dramatic surge in border crime and violence in recent years due to intense competition between Mexican drug cartels and criminal smuggling organizations that employ predatory tactics to realize their profits.

(3) Law enforcement agencies at the United States northern border also face challenges from transnational smuggling organizations.

(4) In response, DHS has partnered with Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement counterparts to create the Border Enforcement Security Task Force (BEST) initiative as a comprehensive approach to addressing border security threats. These multi-agency teams are designed to increase information-sharing and collaboration among the participating law enforcement agencies.

(5) BEST teams incorporate personnel from ICE, United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATFE), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the United States Coast Guard (USCG), and the U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO), along with other key Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies.

(6) Foreign law enforcement agencies participating in BEST include Mexico's Secretaria de Seguridad Publica (SSP), the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

SEC. 3. BORDER ENFORCEMENT SECURITY TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 432. BORDER ENFORCEMENT SECURITY TASK FORCE.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department a program to be known as the Border Enforcement Security Task Force (referred to in this section as 'BEST').

"(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of BEST is to establish units to enhance border security by addressing and reducing border security threats and violence by—

"(1) facilitating collaboration among Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agencies to execute coordinated activities in furtherance of border security, and homeland security; and

"(2) enhancing information-sharing, including the dissemination of homeland security information among such agencies.

"(c) COMPOSITION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITS.—

"(1) COMPOSITION.—BEST units may be comprised of personnel from—

"(A) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

"(B) U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

"(C) the United States Coast Guard;

"(D) other Department personnel, as appropriate

"(E) other Federal agencies, as appropriate;

"(F) appropriate State law enforcement agencies;

"(G) foreign law enforcement agencies, as appropriate;

"(H) local law enforcement agencies from affected border cities and communities; and

"(I) appropriate tribal law enforcement agencies.

"(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITS.—The Secretary is authorized to establish BEST units in jurisdictions in which such units can contribute to

BEST missions, as appropriate. Before establishing a BEST unit, the Secretary shall consider—

"(A) whether the area in which the BEST unit would be established is significantly impacted by cross-border threats;

"(B) the availability of Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement resources to participate in the BEST unit;

"(C) the extent to which border security threats are having a significant harmful impact in the jurisdiction in which the BEST unit is to be established, and other jurisdictions in the country; and

"(D) whether or not an Integrated Border Enforcement Team already exists in the area in which the BEST unit would be established.

"(3) DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—In determining whether to establish a new BEST unit or to expand an existing BEST unit in a given jurisdiction, the Secretary shall ensure that the BEST unit under consideration does not duplicate the efforts of other existing interagency task forces or centers within that jurisdiction.

"(d) OPERATION.—After determining the jurisdictions in which to establish BEST units under subsection (c)(2), and in order to provide Federal assistance to such jurisdictions, the Secretary may—

"(1) direct the assignment of Federal personnel to BEST, subject to the approval of the head of the department or agency that employs such personnel; and

"(2) take other actions to assist Federal, State, local, and tribal entities to participate in BEST, including providing financial assistance, as appropriate, for operational, administrative, and technological costs associated with the participation of Federal, State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies in BEST.

"(e) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which BEST is established under this section, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the effectiveness of BEST in enhancing border security and reducing the drug trafficking, arms smuggling, illegal alien trafficking and smuggling, violence, and kidnapping along and across the international borders of the United States, as measured by crime statistics, including violent deaths, incidents of violence, and drug-related arrests."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents under section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101(b)) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 431 the following:

"Sec. 432. Border Enforcement Security Task Force."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 915, the Jaime Zapata Border Enforcement Security Task Force Act. This bill, which will codify Border Enforcement